

REMARKS

The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed on April 22, 2008. Claims 1-9, 15-18 and 41 are pending in the Application. Claims 1-6, 9, 15-17 and 41 are allowed. Claims 7 and 18 are rejected. Claim 8 is objected to. Claim 7 is currently amended. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the Application in view of the remarks below.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants note and appreciate the Examiner's indication that Claims 1-6, 9, 15-17 and 41 are allowable.

Claim Rejection – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 7 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,497,615 issued to Noe et al. ("*Noe*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,285,123 issued to Kataoka et al. ("*Kataoka*"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and all assertions therein.

Claim 7, as amended, recites "an annular-shaped bearing rotatably receiving a cylindrical portion of said rotor through an annulus defined in said bearing, said bearing secured to said body to prevent rotation of an outer surface of the bearing, said bearing adapted to support said rotor so that said rotor can rotate about a longitudinal axis; and a damper positioned between the outer surface of said bearing and said body."

However, the Office Action has not shown that *Noe* discloses a damper positioned between a outer surface of a bearing and a body of an electricity generating system, where the bearing is secured to the body to prevent rotation of the outer surface of the bearing. The Office Action refers to the bearing spring foil 238 and the bearing air foil 240 of FIGURE 4B in *Noe* (Office Action, page 3). According to the cited figure, the bearing spring foil 238 resides between the bearing air foil 240 and a bearing housing interior 242. However, the Office Action has not shown that the bearing air foil 240 is secured to a body of an electricity generating

system to prevent rotation of the bearing air foil 240. Indeed, it appears that the bearing air foil 240 rotates during operation. *Noe* explains that “[t]he bearing housing interior or bore 242, compliant bearing spring foil 238, and compliant bearing air foil 240 are sized to receive and allow for clearance of the alternator rotor 222 upon final assembly and the passage of air during rotation” (*Noe*, 10:55-60).

Thus, *Noe* has not been shown to teach or suggest at least the limitations of “an annular-shaped bearing rotatably receiving a cylindrical portion of said rotor through an annulus defined in said bearing, said bearing secured to said body to prevent rotation of an outer surface of the bearing, said bearing adapted to support said rotor so that said rotor can rotate about a longitudinal axis; and a damper positioned between the outer surface of said bearing and said body,” recited in claim 7. Therefore, the rejection of claim 7 is deficient. Claim 18 depends from claim 7 and includes all of its limitations. Moreover, *Kataoka* has not been applied to address the deficiencies of *Noe*. For at least these reasons, the rejection of claim 18 is also deficient. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 7 and 18.

Claim Objection

The Office Action objects to claim 8 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants note and appreciate the indication that claim 8 recites allowable subject matter. Claim 8 depends from independent claim 7. For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants request withdrawal of the objection to claim 8.

CONCLUSION

Any circumstance in which the Applicants have (a) addressed certain comments of the examiner does not mean that the Applicants concede other comments of the examiner, (b) made arguments for the patentability of some claims does not mean that there are not other good reasons for patentability of those claims and other claims, or (c) amended or canceled a claim does not mean that the Applicants concede any of the examiner's positions with respect to that claim or other claims.

In view of the above, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully submit that the Application is in condition for allowance, and request such a Notice. If the present Application is not allowed and/or if one or more of the rejections is maintained or made final, Applicants hereby request a telephone conference with the Examiner and further request that the Examiner contact the undersigned agent to schedule a telephone conference.

No additional fees are believed due at this time. However, please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 22, 2008

/Michael K. Henry/
Michael K. Henry, Ph.D.
Reg. No. 59,516

Fish & Richardson P.C.
P.O. Box 1022
Minneapolis, MN 55440-1022
Telephone: (214) 760-6161
Facsimile: (214) 747-2091